PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Coastal Conservation and Research, Inc.	**Amount Requested**	$ 7,567,669
Proposal Title	Implementing IRWM Projects in the Greater Monterey County Region – Round 2	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 12,647,031

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal consists of the nine projects: (1) County of Monterey: San Lucas Water District Public Water Supply Project; (2) Pajaro/Sunny Mesa Community Services District: Springfield Water Project; (3) City of Salinas and Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency: Dry Weather Runoff Diversion Program; (4) Resource Conservation District of Monterey County: Salinas River Watershed Invasive Non-native Plant Control and Restoration Program; (5) Resource Conservation District of Monterey County: Monterey County Farm Water Quality Assistance Program; (6) Ecology Action: Monterey Bay Green Gardener Training and Certification Program; (7) Elkhorn Slough Foundation: Ridgeline to Tideline – Water Resource Conservation in Elkhorn Slough; (8) Central Coast Wetlands Group: Deployment of the Greater Monterey County Regional Water Quality Monitoring Network; and (9) Save our Shores: Watershed Protection Program – Annual Coastal Cleanup Day in Monterey County.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	15/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	10/10
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**49**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationale is incomplete and insufficient. The work plan addresses the goals and objectives of the adopted IRWM plan. There are differences between the BMS version and the hardcopy submittal, making it difficult to determine which version is correct. While some projects are more robust than others, collectively the tasks for each project are not of adequate detail and completeness to support that the projects can be implemented. For example, project 2 only takes the design to 90%, but includes permits as deliverables. It is unclear how the permits will be obtained without 100% design plans. Some of the tasks do not include appropriate

deliverables based on the scope. For example, Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are identified as deliverables, but the scope does not mention the preparation of RFPs. Project 5 is largely outreach and assessments with vague deliverables. Project 8 lacks sufficient rationale and documentation in that it does not utilize key existing data collection efforts, explain how the new data will be collected to enable cumulative improvement to water quality in the timeframe, and justify the location of a new Land/Ocean Biogeochemical Observatory probe. Although project support documentation is provided at times, the documentation is rarely referenced within the application to explain how it relates to the project scope.

BUDGET

The budgets for less than half the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information, many costs cannot be verified as reasonable and supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. The costs shown cannot be determined as reasonable because the estimates are not substantiated, documentation for certain estimates is lacking, and the lump sums lack reasonable explanation. Supporting documentation which is included is not specifically linked to specific project budgets. Hourly rates are not explained for some projects, and are not consistent for the same title. Permit fee schedules are not included and could have been used as support documentation. Source of engineer estimates are not documented. Mileage is included even though it is not an eligible cost. In some cases, operations and maintenance is also included in the scope and budget, which is also not an eligible cost.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, and the proposal demonstrates a readiness to begin construction of a least one project no later than October 2014, but it does not meet all the criteria. It is unclear if the schedules are reasonable because the milestones are shown over long period of times. For example, projects 2 and 3 extend the reporting period beyond the end of the project for unknown reasons. Project completion dates and milestones are not always consistent with the scope deliverables. The final project completion report dates are not shown.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The targets are not all appropriate for the claimed benefits as they are not a quantifiable means of measuring project performance. For example, one of project 3's targets is "A notable reduction of pollutant loading reaching the Salinas River." As a target this lacks specificity that would allow someone to use monitoring to determine if the target is met. Not all the measurement tools and methods will monitor the project performance and target progress. For example, project 5 does include mostly appropriate targets (e.g., 30% reduction in nutrients), but the measurement tools and methods are not fully described to ensure they are sufficient and feasible to monitor targets. The 10% nutrient load reduction in one or more of the three watersheds within the timeframe is not likely feasible for project 8, and difficult to document especially without flow measurements. A combination of qualitative and quantitative targets is included, but there could be clearer linkage between the measurement tools and methods to targets.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits, but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects, and the physical benefits are not well described. The technical support material is merely listed but does not explain how the material supports each project nor is there supporting documentation or explanation confirming the benefits that each project claims. For example, projects 1 and 3 reclaim water for agricultural irrigation and lower pollutant loads to the Salinas River and Reclamation Ditch, but the water quality benefits are not quantified as the applicant states there isn't baseline data. Project 5 claims soil conservation as a benefit; however, there is no information provided to support this claim. The claimed benefit for project 8 is the

"installation of expanded LOBO monitoring array and nutrient monitoring equipment, which will provide much-needed water quality data for the region", but the applicant doesn't justify clearly how the water quality data will be used to benefit the region.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Quantified benefits are less than costs for most projects. Qualitative benefits were also presented, but not well supported.

Two projects (1 and 2) address contaminated drinking water in DACs. Neither project has a preferred alternative to implement, but projected results are reasonable. The economic analysis should also address the question of whether or not the proposed studies are themselves cost-effective. Two other projects (3 and 8) would improve data collection, but potential physical and economic benefits are not clear. The economic analysis could have addressed the question of whether or not the proposed data collection efforts are themselves cost-effective.

Two projects (5 and 6) are contained educational components with physical benefits that are not well supported. For both of these projects, monetized benefits are less than costs.

For other projects, the potential benefits are not well-documented. Flood damage reduction from Arundo removal is not well documented. For project 7, quantified benefits appear to be much less than costs. Additionally, a major source of the water quality problem, undersized culverts, is apparently not addressed.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that five program preferences and seven statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for ten of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects; (3) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; (4) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Climate Change Response Actions; (8) Expand environmental stewardship; (9) Protect surface water and groundwater quality; and (10) Ensure equitable distribution of benefits.